DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 865 HE 030 656

AUTHOR	Bracco, Kathy Reeves
TITLE	State Structures for the Governance of Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography.
INSTITUTION	California Higher Education Policy Center, San Jose.
SPONS AGENCY	Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, PA.; James G. Irvine Foundation, San Francisco, CA.
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	55p.; For related documents, see HE 030 657-664.
AVAILABLE FROM	California Higher Education Policy Center, 160 West Santa Clara St., Suite 704, San Jose, CA 95113; phone: 408-271-2699; fax: 408-287-6709 (Report No. 97-12).
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Business Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Governance; Governing Boards; Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; State Government

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography was developed as part of the State Structures for the Governance of Higher Education project, a national research effort. It identifies literature on governance in higher education, government, business, and K-12 education. A list of common abbreviations precedes the main listing. The 117 citations are listed alphabetically by author and usually include an abstract. Citations are dated from 1971 through 1997. An appendix lists the members of the National Advisory Committee to the State Structures Project. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 412 865

STATE STRUCTURES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

An Annotated Bibliography

A Report from

THE CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY CENTER

Spring 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 030 656

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CA Higher Education Policy Center

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

State Structures for the Governance of Higher Education

An Annotated Bibliography

By Kathy Reeves Bracco

Spring 1997

Prepared for
State Structures for the Governance of Higher Education
and
The California Higher Education Policy Center

© The California Higher Education Policy Center

Table of Contents

Preface ..... *iii*
Abbreviations ..... *iv*

Annotated Bibliography 1

Appendix: National Advisory Committee Members 43
About The California Higher Education Policy Center 44

Preface

State Structures for the Governance of Higher Education is a national research project concerning state governing structures for higher education. This project was conducted by The California Higher Education Policy Center with support from The Pew Charitable Trusts and The James Irvine Foundation. The purpose of the research is to better understand how states differ in the design of their governance structures, what difference in performance can be related to choice of governing structures, and how structure affects the strategies available to state policy makers with regard to the state's higher education system. For the purpose of this research, a state system of higher education includes public and private postsecondary institutions as well as the arrangements for regulating, coordinating and funding them.

The products of the study include nine different publications: seven case studies, this comparative study, and an annotated bibliography. The *case studies* provide separate summaries of higher education governance for the seven states in this project: California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, New York, and Texas. These reports were reviewed for accuracy by knowledgeable individuals within each state. Following the completion of the case study reports, a *comparative study* was developed to provide an interpretive synthesis of the data in the case studies. This *annotated bibliography* has been compiled to highlight relevant literature on governance in higher education, government, business, and K–12 education. This bibliography also includes several theoretical pieces that helped to frame the conceptual design of the research.

Throughout the project, the research team was guided by the advice of a National Advisory Committee comprised of 18 experts in higher education governance issues. We would like to thank each of the committee members for their assistance in this project (their names are listed in the Appendix to this bibliography). In addition, we wish to thank the following individuals for their assistance in reviewing drafts of the case studies: Kenneth Ashworth, William Barba, Joseph Burke, Raymond Cardozier, Patrick Dallet, Cameron Fincher, Edward Hines, David Leslie, Marvin Peterson, William Pickens, Stephen Portch, Jack Smart, and Richard Wagner.

Kathy Reeves Bracco
Senior Policy Analyst
The California Higher Education Policy Center

Abbreviations

AASCU	American Association of State Colleges and Universities
AAUP	American Association of University Professors
ACE	American Council on Education
AGB	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
ASHE	Association for the Study of Higher Education
ECS	Education Commission of the States
ERIC	Educational Research Information Clearinghouse
NCHEMS	National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
NEA	National Education Association
SHEEO	State Higher Education Executive Officers
SUNY	State University of New York
UC	University of California
UNC	University of North Carolina

Ackoff, R. L. *The Democratic Corporation.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Ackoff suggests that the profound changes we are experiencing require radical transformations in our organizations. He argues that to survive in the modern turbulent economy, organizations must be viewed, managed, and organized as social systems. He identifies a system as a whole that contains two or more parts and that satisfies the following five conditions: (1) the whole has one or more defining functions; (2) each part of the system can affect the whole; (3) each subset of parts is necessary but insufficient; (4) no part has an independent effect on the system; and (5) no subset of parts has an independent effect on the system. We cannot expect to have effective change by breaking organizations apart and solving each part separately, he argues; rather, it is the interactions between parts that is critical.

———. "Systems Thinking and Thinking Systems." *System Dynamics Review* 10 nos. 2–3 (Summer/Fall 1994), pp. 175–188.

Ackoff argues that enterprises have evolved from mechanical to organismic to social systems. The most important aspect of the performance of a social system, he argues, is how the parts interact with one another. Effective system management must focus on the interactions of the parts, not the performance of the parts individually. Systems can only be understood by synthesis (first understanding the behavior of the larger system, and then explaining the behavior of its parts by revealing the relationship between the parts and the larger containing system). He contrasts this with trying to understand a system by analysis, which involves taking a system apart initially and trying to understand the behavior of its parts separately.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Committee C on College and University Teaching, Research and Publication. "The Politics of Intervention: External Regulation of Academic Activities and Workloads in Higher Education." *Academe*, January/February 1996, pp. 46–52.

This report argues that there is a new and troubling state involvement in higher education. It suggests that traditionally there was a balance between higher education and politics characterized by a level of concern and supervision that stopped short of

intervention. States got involved in identifying missions, maintaining general accountability, and expressing of the public interest. "New state involvement," the report argues, often amounts to aggressive micromanagement and intervention into areas traditionally considered best defined by those within the academy. The committee claims that legislators and state boards should be leading the fight for institutional autonomy and more resources, and that external intervention into teaching loads, post-tenure review and other areas will not lead to qualitative improvements in higher education.

Aper, J., and D. Hinkle. "State Policies for Assessing Student Outcomes." *Journal of Higher Education* 62, no. 5 (September/October 1991), pp. 539–555.

This case study, which traces the development of Virginia's policy for assessing student outcomes, attempts to explain the implications of Virginia's experience for other states. State policy makers in Virginia wanted to see that institutions were examining their assumptions and results, but did not want to establish a criteria for accountability. The study found that the general and vague requirements established by the state officials may give the institutions flexibility in the design of assessment efforts, but left the purpose or the use of the assessment results unclear. They conclude that statewide requirements must include some information on how data/results will be used.

Appleberry, J. B. "The Restructuring of American Higher Education." Speech given to the Advisory Commission on Investing in the State Colleges, New Jersey, October 1, 1993.

Appleberry discusses the need for restructuring higher education in response to the dramatic changes that it will face in the next decade: demographic shifts, changes in the accessibility of information, and changes in work requirements. He argues that these transformations will bring about a need to reform higher education as well, particularly related to: the basic purposes of higher education, a new look what educational institutions are and what they do, different expectations for faculty, change in the content of a student's total education (to make it more lifelong) and the number and type of providers of higher education. He argues that as we address these changes, we must continue to support undergraduate teaching and strive for accessibility through low tuition. He says we must: invest in technologies; encourage the establishment of partnerships, particularly with businesses; develop mechanisms for stable, predictable funding; and provide campuses and boards with the autonomy necessary to be responsible for outcomes.

Armajani, B., R. Heydinger, and P. Hutchinson. *A Model for the Reinvented Higher Education System.* Denver: SHEEO/ECS, January 1994.

This report presents a new model for higher education, based on what the authors call "educational enterprises." This is not, according to the authors, a privatization model. Rather, it is one way of rethinking what the higher education system might look like if attempts were made to make it more efficient and of better quality. The enterprise model would establish a higher education policy board that develops broad guidelines and sets overall objectives for higher education (in the state, presumably). Under this board, seven "enterprises" would be responsible for implementation of those objectives. However, the proposal calls for the enterprises to contract out for teaching, technology, facilities, etc., to specialized "enterprises." In this way, one faculty member may work for a number of educational enterprises. In addition, such services as learning resources (libraries, serials, etc.) would be housed in a learning resource enterprise, available for contract with all educational and teaching enterprises. User institutions would pay for the services that they use, and these payments would keep the system running. The enterprises in this model are all designed to be public corporations, directly accountable to the public.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). *Renewing the Academic Presidency: Strong Leadership for Tougher Times.* Washington, D.C.: 1996.

This is the report of a blue-ribbon commission chaired by Gerald Baliles, former Governor of Virginia. The commission examined the roles of the academic president, governing boards, faculty and policy makers with specific attention to the role of each in shared governance. The report suggests that colleges and universities must become more responsive to external conditions (declining resources, increasing demand, growth in technology), and that they need strong presidents in order to do so. The report calls on presidents to lead a process of clarifying the nature of shared governance and decision making on campuses. Recommendations to governing boards include support for strong-presidents capable of developing a vision for the institution. Faculty are challenged to respond to the changing environment. Policy makers are called upon to reform the process for selecting trustees and reduce regulation in return for more accountability from higher education.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and the Pew Higher Education Roundtable. "A Calling to Account." Special Issue of *Policy Perspectives*, July 1995.

This essay was developed from a special roundtable convened by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) and the Pew Higher Education Roundtable in December 1994. The purpose of the roundtable was to consider the role of trustees in helping institutions of higher education undertake their own restructuring. The essay suggests that a partnership between trustees and faculty is critical for

restructuring to take place, as the academic and business sides of the university must work together. Several basic guidelines for the role of trustees, presidents, and faculty are suggested.

Atwell, R. "Higher Education Governance in Despair." *Journal for Higher Education Management* 11, no. 2 (Winter/Spring 1996), pp. 13–19.

Atwell argues that the basic assumptions of college and university governance are no longer valid and that given current circumstances (including external interventions, fiscal realities, and self-serving constituencies), higher education governance has become dysfunctional. He recommends some guiding principles for improving governance, including a series of bargains that should be struck: (1) a "bargain" between state policy leaders and systems or campuses, which says that systems or campuses will be held accountable for results but will determine the method of assessing outcomes; (2) a "bargain" between the campus and system where system heads should be responsible for relationships with the political structure but should not be involved in academic matters, with the exception of long-term academic planning; (3) a bargain between the system head and the governing board to encourage the board to see itself as a corporate board, setting the overall parameters for the relationship and then holding the system leader accountable for results.

Barzelay, M., with B. Armajani. *Breaking Through Bureaucracy: A New Vision for Managing in Government*. Berkeley: UC Press, 1992.

The authors argue that much of the poor performance in government is due to the influence of the "bureaucratic paradigm," characterized by central control, ideas of economy and efficiency, and rigid adherence to rules. They look at ways in which the performance of public sector organizations could be improved, through the experience of one state government—Minnesota. The book focuses on reforms and changes in the management practices in Minnesota state government that began in the early 1980s—experiments with ideas such as customer service, empowering front-line employees, and selectively introducing market forces into the government.

Benjamin, R., and S. Carroll. *Impediments and Imperatives in Redesigning Higher Education*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, not dated.

The authors argue that the basic assumptions built into current governing structures for higher education obstruct effective responses to the transformations facing higher education. The report cites a lack of mechanisms at the campus, system and state levels to address such issues as resource allocation based on needs and priorities; program sharing/collaboration within and across institutions and even across states; focus of mission; and elimination of campuses. The authors claim that more resources cannot be the only solution and that redesign is necessary. They call for a redesign that

includes an emphasis on setting priorities at the state, system and institutional levels, and allocating resources according to these priorities.

Benjamin, R., et al. *The Redesign of Governance in Higher Education*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1993.

This paper calls for a new and improved governance system that can respond to financial and other problems. The authors conclude that improvements must be interactive, that all participants must have a role, and that there must be open information and discussion. They suggest that the present governance systems were designed to manage growth, but are now incapable of reallocating resources. They question whether the higher education sector has the incentives to respond to fiscal crises in a way that best serves the public interest, or whether the system has the necessary tools to respond appropriately to these crises. The challenge involves designing improved governance tools that would allow institutions to reallocate resources based on revised priorities. The redesign of the system must address three fundamental areas: the inability of the system to set priorities currently; the lack of comparative information regarding the performance and needs of higher education; and the high level of external constraints that impede any progress.

Berdahl, R. "Public Universities and State Governments: Is the Tension Benign?" *Educational Record*, Winter 1990, pp. 38–42.

Berdahl examines the relationship between the state and the university. He makes a distinction between academic freedom and university autonomy. He makes a further distinction between what he calls substantive autonomy (the power of the institution to determine its own goals and programs) and procedural autonomy (the power of the institution to determine the means by which it will pursue its goals). Berdahl argues that state intervention that limits academic freedom or that creates excessive procedural controls is counterproductive. He claims that while the state should play an important role in decisions that affect the substantive autonomy of higher education, the state must seek a "constructive partnership." Berdahl suggests that coordinating boards have not yet lived up to their potential and that institutional leadership has not made the commitment to "unreluctant participation" in the coordination process. He warns that if institutions do not learn to live with state boards, they will have to face a much less benign state demand for accountability from those outside of higher education.

———. *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: ACE, 1971.

Berdahl suggests that one of the main problems in examining the relationship between the state and institutions of higher education has involved the failure to recognize that academic freedom and university autonomy are not synonymous. Autonomy, he says, is the power of a college or university to govern itself without outside controls. The

issue is whether state influence is confined to proper areas (Berdahl distinguishes substantive from procedural autonomy) and whether it is expressed through a sensitive state mechanism. Berdahl creates a classification system of state oversight agencies that has become commonly used in the literature on state governance in higher education: advisory boards; regulatory or coordinating boards; and consolidated governing boards. He argues that autonomy can be retained within statewide systems, but calls for close participation of institutions in any policy-setting, and for policies to be set forth as guidelines rather than as controls. He says that the choice between governing or coordinating boards at the state level depends on the size and complexity of the state and its higher education system, the state's political traditions, and its needs and resources. He quotes James Miller in saying that "Organizational structure is less important than adherence to certain organizational and administrative principles." He concludes that some form of coordinating agency (one that is specialized to address higher education) will be the appropriate machinery to handle relations between states and universities.

Bowen, W. G. "When a Business Leader Joins a Nonprofit Board." *Harvard Business Review*, September/October 1994, pp. 38–43.

Bowen discusses the critical role of business executives as members of nonprofit boards and describes various situations in which these executives have failed to bring their "tough-mindedness" to the business of the nonprofit organizations of which they are trustees. He cites a number of reasons for this: business executives want to shed their "barbarian" image; they join the board for status but are not necessarily concerned with substantive work; and they are unfamiliar with the peculiarities and subtleties of the nonprofit's mission or accounting mechanisms. He argues that nonprofit boards have a great deal to learn from corporate boards, particularly in using benchmark data and in monitoring discrepancies between planned outcomes and actual results. He says that business executives, given the proper opportunity and education regarding the organization's mission, can contribute greatly to the nonprofit board.

Burke, J. C. "The Proof is in the Performance." *Trusteeship*, May/June 1994, pp. 25–29.

In this article, the former provost and vice chancellor for academic affairs in the SUNY system calls on boards of trustees to require that the institutions they govern make annual performance reports available to the general public. He discusses SUNY's performance reporting efforts, which began with a series of goal statements adopted by the board, then continued with the development of a set of performance indicators to show the extent to which the system was meeting those goals. The board wanted to delegate authority to campuses but also maintain accountability, and Burke argues that the performance reports were the best way of establishing this balance. The five goals of SUNY 2000 were essential to the identification of performance indicators: (1) provide full access to undergraduate education; (2) achieve excellence in undergraduate

programs and services; (3) reach national competitiveness in graduate programs; (4) meet state needs in economic development, environmental conservation, health care, education, and social services; and (5) enhance management efficiency and effectiveness.

Burns, J. M., J. W. Peltason, T. E. Cronin. *State and Local Politics: Government by the People*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1990.

This extensive reference on state and local policy making includes chapters on state and local politics, state constitutions, and the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of state governments. Of particular interest is information on the various powers of state governors and state legislatures in the 50 states. Individual chapters include recommendations for further reading on each topic.

Callan, P. M. "The Gauntlet for Multicampus Systems." *Trusteeship*, May/June 1994, pp.17–19.

Callan questions the utility of multicampus systems for the future of higher education. He suggests that higher education and public policy leaders must examine some of the fundamental issues related to governance and organization by systems: Can systems respond effectively to the pressures and demands of the future? Are systems cost-effective? Do they protect against undue political intervention? Are systems effective advocates for campuses, and do they strengthen or weaken campus leadership? What is the role of lay governance in a multicampus system? Callan argues that it makes sense to question the forms of governance, organization and coordination that will be necessary to move higher education into the next century, and that the answers to these questions will likely differ from state to state.

———. *Perspectives on the Current Status of and Emerging Policy Issues for State Coordinating Boards*. AGB Occasional Paper No. 2. Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1991.

Callan traces the development of statewide coordinating boards and discusses the potential issues facing these institutions as they enter the 1990s. He contrasts the roles and responsibilities of coordinating boards with those of consolidated governing boards, then discusses the membership, structure, and functions of coordinating boards as they evolved in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. He suggests that the first challenge for coordinating boards in the 1990s will be to influence and respond to public policy agendas, and to respond to state leaders' increasing impatience with colleges and universities. He concludes that these boards are fragile institutions, and that they are really a means to a larger end: public policy that supports the accessibility and quality of higher education. He notes that there is an assumption that coordinating boards maintain a healthy tension between institutional interests and statewide public interests.

and that this produces a more responsive higher education system. He suggests that this is an assumption that will be tested in the 1990s.

Callan, P. M., K. R. Bracco, and R. C. Richardson. "State Higher Education Policy For a Time of Adaptive Change." *Seeking Excellence Through Independence: Liberating Public Colleges from State Regulation*. Edited by T. MacTaggart. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, forthcoming.

This chapter suggests that conditions in the emerging institutional environment—increasing demand for higher education, increased concern about opportunity, increasingly constrained resources, concern with quality of higher education, and the continuing challenges of technology—will demand new state approaches to higher education. Traditional approaches, characterized as indifference/deference or centralization/regulation will not adequately address the demands of the new environment. These past approaches have effectively responded to technical changes, but current conditions require adaptive change. An alternative approach—one that effectively manages the tensions between public interests and the legitimate interests of professionals—is needed. The authors suggest this is characterized by the federal model. Examples are provided of states that use federal principles in their higher education system and of the strategies these states have used to stimulate adaptive change.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *The Capitol and the Campus: State Responsibility for Postsecondary Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

This report argues that states should continue to carry the primary governmental responsibility for higher education, and that the United States should not move in the direction of a national system of higher education. The report recommends that states broaden their responsibility to cover the entire range of postsecondary education and that they provide for universal access. In addition, the report expresses concern over regulatory councils that are too heavy handed, but calls for some planning and consultation to be done by a state agency. The report also suggests that some state support be provided to private institutions. The commission identifies several areas in which it is appropriate for the state to have some control over decisions: setting the number of spaces available in institutions, determining the number and location of new campuses, establishing the size of institutions by type, establishing general admissions policies, determining general levels of budgets and salaries, and overseeing the effective use of resources.

———. *Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

This report establishes a framework for the successful governance of higher education. It begins by providing a contextual background for higher education in America, and then addresses the following topics in the governance of higher education: intellectual, academic and administrative independence; the role of the board and the president; collective bargaining; tenure; student influence; and emergency decision making. In order to assure academic freedom, the report recommends limits on state control, with careful delineation of responsibilities between the state and the institution. The role of the board is defined as one of setting general policies and hiring a president, who will then be responsible for carrying out these policies. Collective bargaining should be instituted only after faculty consider very carefully its effects, and a federal law should be enacted concerning the specific case of collective bargaining by faculty. Tenure should be extended to all campuses and should be offered only to as many faculty as is appropriate. Students should be given some say in the policies that affect them, but should not be allowed to control these policies. The report ends with a discussion of the future of higher education governance, suggesting that the new role of governance may well be managing conflict instead of achieving consensus.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *The Control of the Campus*. Lawrenceville: Princeton University Press, 1982.

This report addresses the essential concepts of governance in American higher education. After tracing the historical evolution of the different groups that govern higher education and the changing roles of all of these groups, it provides a set of recommendations regarding the governance of the campus. At the federal level, the report suggests that the federal government should provide only for those needs that are truly national in character, and that public officials should be responsible only for the fiscal oversight of these programs. For regional accreditation agencies, the report claims that accreditation for all institutions should be based on outcomes, not inputs. It says that the state should make certain that decisions are made as close as possible to the point where they will be carried out. It recommends that statewide boards allow campuses to make improvements in efficiency, instead of placing them under more bureaucratic control. The report recommends that boards of trustees be responsible only for the major policy concerns of institutions, including selecting presidents, setting educational policies, expanding facilities, and approving budgets. The report urges that campuses distinguish between the corporate control of trustees and the local authority of various campus groups.

———. *The States and Higher Education: A Proud Past and a Vital Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

This report examines the state role in the future of higher education, suggesting that it should include: supporting innovation, preserving the private sector, encouraging the use of technology, encouraging leadership at the campus level, and avoiding rigidity in formulas. The authors regret the increase in centralization of higher education that has occurred, and call for increased competition among institutions. The increase in coordination has come about, they say, due to growth in enrollments, which led to increased public interest, increased intercampus rivalries, encouragement at the federal level for a statewide mechanism for the distribution of student aid, and increases in staff at the state level. The advantage of a coordinating board, the report suggests, is that it is able to act as an umbrella under which many institutions and agencies can be placed. Coordinating boards should balance the public interest with the interests of the educational community.

Chait, R. *The New Activism of Corporate Boards and the Implications for Campus Governance*. Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1995.

Chait argues that the best models for managing higher education can be found in the corporate sector. In recent years, corporate boards have become increasingly responsive to the company stakeholders, becoming more active and more accountable in the process. College and university boards, he argues, should follow this lead and change the relationship between the board and the president. Governing boards should be "expected to challenge convention" to ensure that institutions serve key constituents beyond the faculty and administration. He calls on the media to ask difficult questions, making boards more visible. Chait also calls for better communication—that is unscripted—between boards and the stakeholders of the college or university.

Chait, R., T. P. Holland, and B. Taylor. *The Effective Board of Trustees*. Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1993.

Based on interviews with more than 108 board members and trustees at 22 independent, liberal arts and comprehensive colleges, the authors find a set of specific characteristics and behaviors that distinguish strong boards from weak boards. The six competencies, or "dimensions," make up the various chapters of the book. These include: taking into account the context of the organization; making sure trustees are well informed; nurturing the development of trustees as a group; drawing upon multiple perspectives to analyze problems; developing and maintaining healthy relationships with key constituencies; and ensuring a strategic approach to the future of the organization. Each chapter defines the particular competency, describes that competency based on relevant literature (with specific examples from the interviews), and suggests exercises or questions boards might use to try to enhance their

effectiveness in that competency area. The final chapter of the book is aimed at institutional presidents, and recommends actions they can take to enhance board effectiveness.

———. *Improving the Performance of Governing Boards*. Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1996.

In this follow-up to their 1991 book, *The Effective Board of Trustees*, the authors show how boards can improve their performance. Based on a multi-year study, this book has relevance for boards of colleges and universities as well as other nonprofit organizations. Chapters include how to evaluate and monitor board performance, how to start and sustain board development, how to bring trustees together as a cohesive group, how to improve the knowledge base of governing board members, and how to use strategic focus to improve the business done by the board. The book concludes with a set of arguments from board members and CEOs on why they resist board development, and a series of counter-arguments from the authors for why board development is actually beneficial to an institution.

Clark, B. R. *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley: UC Press, 1983.

Clark compares national systems of higher education by identifying the basic elements common to all systems and then providing a series of thematic comparisons. The three basic elements are: (1) the way tasks are conceived and arranged; (2) the beliefs, norms and values of the various actors; and (3) the authority or distribution of power. The book's arguments and its various chapters address general questions about how work is arranged, how authority is distributed, how change takes place, and how systems are integrated. The book provides a valuable resource for comparative research in higher education.

Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership. *Presidents Make a Difference: Strengthening Leadership in Colleges and Universities*. Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1994.

This is the report of a commission established by the Association of Governing Boards in 1982 to examine the status of the presidency in American higher education. Based on a wide range of interviews with presidents, trustees, and higher education leaders across the country, the commission develops several recommendations for ways that boards of trustees can help strengthen presidential leadership. The report includes recommendations for reviewing the character of the presidency, reexamining presidential search processes, aiding entrance to the presidency, carrying out informal presidential reviews, finding a proper balance between the responsibility of system and campus heads in multicampus systems, and finding a proper balance in the power of institutional leaders and public authorities.

Council of State Governments. *The Book of the States: 1996–97 Edition*. Lexington, KY: 1996.

This useful reference book, which provides information on state governments, is published every two years. Chapters are organized by aspects of state government, including: state constitutions, elections, finances, intergovernmental affairs, and the executive, legislative and judicial branches. Current essays and statistical information are provided for each chapter.

DiBiasio, D. A. "Higher Education Under Study: A Comparative Analysis of Six Statewide Reports." Paper presented at the ASHE 1986 Annual Meeting. ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED #268 894.

This study reviews the recommendations of six state reports that examined higher education. In each state (Arizona, Colorado, Maine, Michigan, Nebraska, and New York) a commission was asked to examine the status of public higher education. DiBiasio's categorization of the recommendations of these reports shows that program review, finances and governance are the most commonly mentioned categories. Governance issues include calls for single governing boards as well as calls for the removal of single, statewide boards. Recommendations also request increasing institutional flexibility. He notes that recommendations call for increasing both centralization (in cases of quality and economic development) and decentralization (in governance and financial recommendations). He suggests that the contradictions may be due to the fact that issues that the states may want more control over are those issues that are relatively new concerns of the state, such as quality and economic development.

Dressel, P. *The Autonomy of Public Colleges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

This book, which describes the nature and limits of institutional autonomy, begins by distinguishing autonomy from academic freedom. Dressel expresses concern that the autonomy of public colleges is eroding as a result of continued intrusion by state, federal and private interests. He then describes the efforts of institutions in Ohio, Indiana and Wisconsin to maintain their autonomy. In the last chapter, Dressel makes several recommendations regarding balancing autonomy with accountability and responsibility. He states that the loss of autonomy "is unlikely to produce a strong faculty or a strong student body." He argues that on the other hand, institutions must be held accountable. Dressel then explores the essential relationship between autonomy and responsibility, suggesting that to earn autonomy, an institution must show that it is responsibly carrying out the mission it is charged with by the society it serves.

Drucker, P. F. "Really Reinventing Government." *Atlantic Monthly*, February 1995, pp. 49–61.

Drucker discusses the various attempts at "reinventing government" in the Clinton administration, and argues that very few of them have made much of a difference. Drucker argues that rather than focusing on downsizing or saving money from the outset, organizations should begin reinventing themselves by first "rethinking" themselves. Every organization should be confronted with these questions: "What is your mission?" "Is it still the right mission?" "Is it still worth doing?" "If we were not already doing this, would we go into it?" Drucker cites several examples of government agencies and programs that may have served a purpose but are probably no longer necessary or viable. He argues that rather than looking at good intentions of programs, we need to begin to look at results. Drucker concludes by suggesting that most political theory deals with the process rather than the substance of government. He argues that rethinking government would provide the factual information that could lead to new, and much needed, political theory.

Duderstadt, J. J. "The Future of the Public Research University." Speech given to the Pennsylvania State University National Issues Forum, October 7, 1996.

Duderstadt argues that there has been an erosion of the fundamental principles on which public research universities are based, including the notion that higher education is a public good and the research partnership with the federal government. Current and future challenges will lead to a "profound transformation" in the paradigm of the research university. He argues that institutions need to re-articulate the partnership between government, society, and the universities. At the same time, they need to recognize the changed conditions of the 1990s and remove the constraints that prevent research universities from responding to societal needs. Research institutions must provide an environment that regards these changes not as threatening but as an opportunity to engage in learning.

Fisher, J. L. "The Failure of Statewide Coordination." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 16, 1995, p. A48.

In this "point of view" essay, Fisher argues that statewide coordination—in the form of state-level coordinating agencies and state university systems—has not lived up to the expectations of its creators. He argues that statewide coordinating and planning agencies have not brought about more efficient operations, and have not improved academic programs. Most systems, he says, will lose good campus presidents who become frustrated by their inability to provide leadership or innovation due to what he sees as the stifling effects of state boards. Fisher provides a few examples to back up his argument, and concludes by calling for the elimination of both state coordinating agencies and statewide system offices.

Folger, J. and D. Jones. *Using Fiscal Policy to Achieve State Education Goals*. Denver: ECS. 1993.

The authors suggest that in the face of tight state budgets and little hope of full funding for higher education, states must examine new fiscal policies. They propose establishing a three-part budget as a creative way to ensure that the state's interests and priorities are reflected in the allocation of limited resources. Under their concept, there would be a base/core budget that the institutions could manage as they saw fit. Secondly, there would be a capital budget, used only for new buildings and acquisitions. Third, there would be a special-purpose component, comprising approximately 5 to 10 percent of the base, which could include block funding, incentive funding, student funding, or a combination. The authors provide examples of special-purpose funding programs in New Jersey, Ohio and Tennessee.

Gade, M. *Four Multicampus Systems: Some Policies and Practices that Work*. Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1994.

Through a review of the structure and activities of four multicampus systems (the University of North Carolina, the University of California, the institutions of the Kansas Board of Regents, and the Maricopa County Community College District in Phoenix, Arizona) this report attempts to provide information about "successful systems" and "good ideas" that are adaptable to other multicampus systems. Gade identifies leadership, the appointment of CEOs and the allocation of resources as the core functions of the multicampus system, and sees the system's trustees as the "bridge" that brings society's needs and concerns to the university and interprets the institution's needs to the public. Through her interviews, Gade identifies a series of "ideas that work" that multicampus systems may wish to consider.

Glenny, L. A. *Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

In one of the first major examinations of the relationship between the state and higher education, Glenny pursues the following question: "which processes, which organizational pattern of state coordinating boards, and what kinds of relationships between these . . . boards and institutions and other state agencies can secure the most effective diversification and improve the quality of higher education without unduly sacrificing the freedom, autonomy and initiative of the affected colleges and universities?" Glenny argues that central agencies have four primary functions: (1) planning for state needs, and establishing goals and policies to meet those needs; (2) allocating functions and programs to various institutions; (3) determining operational and financial needs of institutions; and (4) determining institutional needs for physical facilities. He reviews the relative advantages and disadvantages of coordinating

agencies and governing agencies at the state level as they try to address these primary functions: he says both systems have been inadequate in long-range statewide planning, and that neither has been effective in coordinating large, diverse systems. Glenny argues that the answer to the "best" organization depends on the specific goals being sought.

Glenny, L. A., and J. Hurst. "Current Statewide Planning Structures and Powers." *Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design*. Edited by L. A. Glenny and G. Weathersby. Boulder: NCHEMS, 1971, pp. 19–39.

In this edited volume, Glenny and Weathersby ask why states have begun to look to statewide planning in higher education, suggesting that planning is a vehicle to effect better institutional management and to enhance public opinion about higher education. Therefore, they say, it is necessary to begin to reevaluate organizational structures to determine which ones would best accomplish statewide planning. In chapter two, Glenny and Hurst claim that since 1959 the trend in higher education governance has been in the direction of developing centralized state structures, with public board members who represent the public interest. The authors look specifically to state coordinating (as opposed to governing) structures to provide the key. Glenny and Hurst suggest that a single statewide governing board is less capable of developing and implementing a long-range planning policy than a coordinating board. The effectiveness of the various statewide agencies, however, depends on the "structure of the board, its powers and jurisdiction, the mode of leadership the board chooses to exercise, and most importantly, on the quality of its professional staff." The three primary priorities for the state coordinating agency, they say, are planning, budget review and program review. The primary challenge regarding coordination is how to achieve objectives—such as economies of scale, efficiency, and reduction of competition—without impairing the flexibility, initiative and diversity of individual institutions. Coordination, they say, is a safeguard to institutional autonomy and is much better than the alternative, which is legislative or gubernatorial controls.

Glenny, L. A. and T. K. Dalglish. *Public Universities, State Agencies, and the Law: Constitutional Autonomy in Decline*. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1973.

The authors examine the substantive and procedural ways in which states relate to their institutions of higher education (including both constitution-based and statutory-based relationships). This volume is directed towards practitioners and presents the results of a research project that studied four states (California, Colorado, Michigan, and Minnesota) that provide state universities with constitutional autonomy, and four additional states whose institutions' legal status is based in statute. The authors conclude that executive and legislative branches continuously test the boundaries of constitutional autonomy, and note that "constitutional autonomy is given in one

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

paragraph (of a constitution) and partly taken away in others." Institutions with constitutional status as well as those based in statute are subject to the general laws of the state. In the end, autonomy really rests on the amount of trust between state government and the institutions of higher education, regardless of constitutional status. They do conclude, however, that much of the value of constitutional status may lie in the fact that it takes time to amend a constitution, and the institutions can use this time to reestablish public confidence and avoid the need for any amendments.

Graham, H. D. "Structure and Governance in American Higher Education: Historical and Comparative Analysis in State Policy." *Journal of Policy History* 1, no. 1 (1989), pp. 80–107.

Graham provides an overview of the literature on governance in American higher education, beginning with a discussion of the "benchmarks" in the statewide coordination literature: Moos' and Rourke's *The Campus and the State*, Glenny's *Autonomy of Public Colleges*, and Berdahl's *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education*. Graham overviews state trends in statewide governance and coordination, from acceleration toward "superboards" in the 1960s and 1970s to the movement toward coordinating boards in the 1980s. Graham concludes by arguing that the lessons of history indicate that the strength of higher education in this country derives in part from the competitive diversity that exists under the decentralized systems of control. He argues that "jockeying for advantage" should not be seen as inefficient, but rather as the "engine" that has made our system the envy of the rest of the world.

Greer, D. G. "Prospective Governance." Draft. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State College Governing Boards Association, November 1995.

Greer argues that traditional governance mechanisms no longer serve higher education or the public very well. While there is no agreement as to the governing structures that would best serve us in the future, he suggests that a set of principles should guide future governing arrangements. These principles, aspects of "prospective governance," involve: a forward-looking approach, responsiveness to the public interest, connection to the greater public system, simplified policy making, distribution of responsibility for decision making and iterative processes. Greer argues that authority for governing higher education is shared across levels, including: federal, state and local governments; system or campus governing boards; and faculty groups. The essay outlines how aspects of prospective governance would work across each of these levels. What is important, he argues, is not the specific form of governing structure a state may choose, but rather that it recognizes the principles of prospective governance in the process.

Greer, D. G., and P. R. Shelly. "A State of Change." *Trusteeship*, July/August 1995, pp. 16–19, 34.

The authors review a restructuring initiative in New Jersey and discuss the outcomes of the initiative a year after implementation. The "sky did not fall" on New Jersey higher education as some had predicted, they argue. Greer and Shelly suggest that there were three elements that made this proposal worthy of institutional support: the opportunity to create a vision for higher education as a public good; a set of well-articulated policy principles; and the prospect of involving higher education leaders and the public in making informed judgments about value and accountability. They note that while it is too soon for long-term conclusions about the New Jersey experience, the future appears bright.

Grossman, R. J. "The Great Debate over Institutional Accountability." *College Board Review*, no. 147 (Spring 1988), pp. 4–6, 38–40.

The author argues that assessment and accountability measures are necessary, but that the driving forces are all external. Support for assessment within higher education, he says, occurs more in word than in deed; while those within higher education say assessment is a good idea, they are not necessarily doing anything about it. Grossman then goes on to give some of the primary arguments that faculty give for why they are resistant to assessment (it forces them to teach to the test, faculty do more than just teach, it violates academic freedom, it is excessively costly, etc.)—and he refutes each one. He argues that since institutions will eventually be held accountable, educators should play an active role in developing and implementing assessment and accountability strategies before the state or other external forces do it for them.

Hairston, E. H. "A Picaresque Journey Through Corporate Change, Technological Tidal Waves and Webby Worldviews." Speech to the Retreat of the Washington Secretariat, Washington, D.C., November 6, 1995.

In this speech to leaders of higher education associations in Washington, Hairston discusses the need for higher education to undergo transformations not unlike those undertaken by business and industry in the last decade. Continued declines in state subsidies, federal grants and financial aid—combined with rising tuition and growth in technological capacities—have placed higher education in a position where it will have to shift or be caught "in the tidal wave." The successful college and university of the future, the author argues, will be much more dependent on the interrelationships among faculty and students than on their departments or structures. She calls for flexible structures that facilitate the flow of information.

Hammer, M. and J. Champy. *Reengineering the Corporation*. New York: Harper-Collins, 1993.

In this much-cited book on reengineering in the corporate sector, the authors stress that reengineering means starting over, not just tinkering with a few problem areas. Corporations no longer perform well because the world in which they operate has changed, and they do not have the capacity to evolve any further. Thus, the authors argue, the only effective answer is to reengineer. They claim that companies should not organize around division of labor and tasks, but rather around work and process. Throughout the book, examples from business and industry are used concerning the ways that companies—some in trouble, some not—have reengineered processes and become more efficient and competitive.

Handy, C. *The Age of Paradox*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1994.

In this sequel to *The Age of Unreason*, Handy discusses the unintended consequences of change, which he calls paradoxes, and he suggests ways to manage the paradoxes. A chapter on federalism discusses the paradoxes inherent in federal systems: they try to be big and small, local and national, centralized and decentralized at the same time. Suggesting that the concept of federalism can be applied to any number of organizations, he notes that while messy and complicated, it may be the only effective alternative available to organizations as the world becomes increasingly complicated. Additional chapters focus on the key concepts of federalism, twin citizenship and subsidiarity.

———. *The Age of Unreason*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1990.

Handy presents the changes that are surrounding us and transforming business, education and the nature of work. He notes that the kinds of discontinous changes we face require discontinuous thinking—looking at everything in a new and different way. He argues that we need new kinds of organizations, new approaches to work, new ideas about the nature of society. He describes the different types of organizations that are emerging (the shamrock, the federal, and the triple I organization) and argues that the best way to move forward is to engage in "upside-down thinking" about our work, organizations and schools—so that we consider these areas in entirely different ways.

———. "Balancing Corporate Power: A New Federalist Paper." *Harvard Business Review* 70, no. 6 (November/December 1992), pp. 59–72.

Handy describes the shift towards federalism in the corporate world, which he thinks is inevitable. This shift is brought about by several paradoxes: (1) organizations must be big and small simultaneously in order to have economies of scale and be responsive to the "human" side of things; (2) business has a preference for free and open markets

that are organized under centralized control; and (3) people desire to run businesses when they cannot afford or do not want to make them their own. There are five basic principles of federalism: subsidiarity, where power belongs to the lowest possible point; interdependence, where power is spread around; the need for common law or language; separation of management, monitoring and governance; and "twin citizenship," which involves belonging to both the smaller business and the larger corporation.

Hannaway, J. "Management Decentralization and Performance-Based Incentives: Theoretical Considerations for Schools." *Improving America's Schools: The Role of Incentives*. Edited by E. Hanushek and D. Jorgenson. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1996, pp. 97–109.

The author reviews the results of school decentralization and performance-based incentive efforts in school reform, and concludes that, taken alone, each is insufficient. While each has limitations, however, together they have the potential to improve student performance and counterbalance some of the disadvantages of the other. She concludes by discussing the need for more research concerning the contribution of school reforms to student performance. While there are many problems that make it difficult to obtain clear results in this type of research, she suggests that we need more than simple models of the way that governance reforms interact with different contexts to affect student performance.

Hannaway, J., and M. Carnoy, editors. *Decentralization and School Improvement: Can We Fulfill the Promise?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

This edited volume challenges the premises and promises of various efforts at decentralization in the school reform movement. The authors suggest that there is little evidence that government reforms lead to any kind of instructional improvements in the classroom. In one chapter, Richard Elmore argues that the decentralization debate is not about teaching and learning in the schools, but rather about defining access, influence and authority. The book examines system-level, organizational-level, and market- or consumer-level decentralization.

Healy, P. "The Republican Contract with Public Colleges." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 26, 1996, pp. A26–27.

This article profiles the "new guard" of public college trustees, those appointed by Republican governors who have moved aggressively to transform the governance of higher education across the country. The new trustees are social and fiscal conservatives who seek to reduce administrative bureaucracies in higher education. Critics of the new trustees argue that they are getting more involved in administrative matters than is fitting for a lay board. The author highlights experiences in Virginia,

New York and California as examples of the aggressive changes in direction sought by the new Republican trustees.

Hearn, J. C. and C. Griswold. "State Level Centralization and Policy Innovation in U.S. Postsecondary Education." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 16, no. 2 (Summer 1994), pp. 161–190.

This report examines the relationship between innovative state policies and governance structures. The authors argue that since very little of the literature on statewide coordination is based in empirical analysis, this research attempts to begin to fill that void. The research examines governance arrangements as a "potentially influential force" on the kinds of innovations adopted, and/or on the overall quantity of innovations adopted. The research includes statistical analyses of the relationship between governance structures (using the categories defined by McGuinness in *State Postsecondary Structures Handbook*) and eight "innovations" grouped according to three categories: (1) academic policy innovations; (2) financial innovations; and (3) innovations in teacher education. The researchers found that states with governing boards or strong coordinating boards were somewhat more likely to undertake innovations than the norm, and that the least activist states were those with planning agencies or "weak" coordinating boards. In general, the larger states were more activist, as were those with lower rates of postsecondary enrollment. The study concludes that governance structures had a greater influence on the adoption of educational innovations than any of the other innovations studied.

Heifitz, R. A. *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1994.

Heifitz relates leadership strategies to the nature of institutional and organizational changes. Central to his discussion is the notion of the difference between technical and adaptive situations. Conditions for technical change, he argues, occur when both a problem and its solutions are clear, and when the solutions lie within the repertoire of the individual or organization. Adaptive change, however, is necessary when neither the problem nor the solution is defined and when changes in "values, attitudes, and behavior" are required. Heifitz identifies the "strategic assets" necessary for dealing with adaptive problems, as well as the principles of leadership that enable individuals or organizations to address adaptive work.

Heifitz, R. A., and D. L. Laurie. "The Work of Leadership." *Harvard Business Review* 75, no. 1 (January/February 1997), pp. 124–134.

The authors argue that companies today face adaptive challenges—challenges that force them to clarify their values, develop new strategies, and learn new ways of operating. These challenges require a different form of leadership, one that employs a learning strategy. The authors suggest six principles for leading adaptive work: (1) get on the

balcony—look at the whole picture to identify or create a context for change: (2) identify the adaptive challenge—determine where changes in values, practices, and relationships are necessary; (3) regulate distress—create a balance between having people see the need for change and having them overwhelmed by the prospect; (4) maintain disciplined attention—get employees to confront trade-offs in values, power and operating procedures; (5) give work back to the people—get people to assume greater responsibility for decision making; and (6) protect voices of leadership from below—allow others to raise questions and identify the adaptive challenge. These principles are illustrated through an example of change at KPMG Netherlands.

Heilbron, L. H. *The College and University Trustee*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

This guidebook for boards of trustees and their members contains lengthy descriptions of the relationships of boards of trustees with one another and with the faculty, students and staff of institutions. It has numerous recommendations for both the establishment and operation of boards of trustees.

Hines, E. R. *Higher Education and State Governments: Renewed Partnership, Cooperation, or Competition?* ASHE ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: ASHE, 1988.

Hines examines the relationships between higher education and state government, focusing specifically on the issue of autonomy and accountability. He outlines the various roles of state level agencies, state and system level boards, and governors and legislatures in the autonomy/accountability dilemma. He further explores the issue through an examination of four critical policy areas: higher education reform generally, academic program review, access and retention of minority students, and outcomes assessment. He argues that the roles of the state and of higher education intersect at many points, depending on the specific policy issue and situation. He calls for a dynamic partnership between the two, where higher education defines the limits of its autonomy and identifies the points at which government becomes intrusive.

Hollander, T. E. "Coordinating Boards Are Under Attack." *Trusteeship*, July/August 1994, pp. 17–19.

Hollander cites the changes in New Jersey's and South Carolina's governing systems as precursors of a national debate on the effectiveness of coordinating boards. He describes what he sees as the important role of statewide boards: to ensure effective, efficient institutions and to keep them out of partisan politics. He believes that boards need to voice a coherent mission for higher education in the state. Without statewide boards, Hollander argues, the budget will become an institutional battleground among presidents who are forced to spend most of their time as lobbyists. In addition, he

warns, without a statewide board there is no one to review the state budget from an educational perspective, which could ultimately be harmful to colleges and universities.

Ihrig, W. "Recasting the Oregon State System." *Executive Strategies* 2, no. 2 (October 1996).

Ihrig describes the transformation of the Oregon State System of Higher Education (OSSHE). After passage of Measure 5 in 1991, higher education responded to sharp reductions in state support by raising tuition and cutting programs. Enrollment dropped as a result, even while projections of enrollment demand rose. OSSHE determined that a fundamental change in the relationship between the state and the system was necessary. The system proposed converting itself into a public corporation and removing itself from state regulation—in exchange for enrolling an additional 2,000 students with no additional state funds. Ihrig describes the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act, passed in 1995, which delegated a number of administrative rules and processes to the Board of Higher Education, including purchasing and collective bargaining. In return, the law calls for periodic reviews of budgets, plans, and outcomes to keep the system accountable. Ihrig describes how OSSHE has streamlined some of its processes to save money and to meet the state's accountability requirements.

Ingram, R. T., and associates. *Governing Public Colleges and Universities: A Handbook for Trustees, Chief Executives and Other Campus Leaders.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

This helpful resource for campus leaders and trustees of public colleges and universities is divided into four parts. Part one includes chapters to help the reader understand the context and environment in which higher education must function. Part two discusses the key responsibilities of governing boards and how to best fulfill those functions. Part three includes chapters on how to develop an effective public board, including the orientation of new board members, the operation of effective board meetings, and the relationship between the board chair and campus chief executive. The final section of the book includes a set of resources including: sample statements of board member responsibilities and desirable qualifications of trustees; results of a survey of public governing board characteristics, policies and practices; self-study criteria for public boards; and recommended readings for board members.

Johnstone, D. B. *Central Administrations of Public Multi-Campus College and University Systems.* Albany: SUNY Press, June 1992.

In this article, Johnstone explains the key roles of system administration, providing both a general discussion and specific examples from his experience as chancellor of the SUNY system. Johnstone argues that there is a natural tendency to be suspicious or resentful of system administrations, particularly during difficult budget periods. He

suggests, however, that in difficult fiscal times it is especially important to have a system structure that will preserve institutional missions and manage downsizing so as to do the "least amount of damage" to access and quality. He notes several benefits of system organization that should not be overlooked: systems are an effective way of achieving coordination among naturally competing campuses; systems advocate to state and other officials on behalf of a variety of campuses, with a unified voice; and systems protect campuses from legislative intrusion. He identifies several responsibilities of systems, both in general and during times of budget constraints.

———. "Does this Gauntlet Need to be Picked Up?" *Trusteeship*, May/June 1994, p. 20.

In this response to an article by Pat Callan in the same issue, Johnstone argues that systems do examine and reexamine the issues that Callan outlines. He argues that the questions must continually be asked because of the complexity of the issues. He suggests that the major rationale for systems is to buffer academic leadership and governance from the "darker side" of state politics. Johnstone also argues that systems encourage a "synergy" among campuses, providing for cost-effective ways of responding to mandates and addressing state needs. Finally, he argues that the changes of the near future will not likely be any greater than the changes that higher education has experienced in the past, and that systems are in a position to continue to adapt to and accommodate new demands.

Jones, D. P. *A Framework for Devising State Policy Toward Higher Education*. Boulder: NCHEMS, 1995.

Jones argues that state governments need a more constructive relationship with institutions of higher education, a more effective "policy framework" for devising higher education policy. He suggests an alternative approach that would result in the following: state policies less focused on the institutional providers and increasingly on the clients as well; increased reliance on market forces and recognition that other forces outside the university (students, the federal government and private industry) have an influence on the market; a shift in focus from internal functions to state needs and expectations; a shift from cost- and expenditure-based budgeting to a philosophy of investment in capacity, with the introduction of incentives for certain priorities; the elimination of unnecessary regulations; and changes in the focus of accountability from adherence to state procedures to attainment of priority objectives.

———. *Strategic Budgeting: The Board's Role in Public Colleges and Universities*. AGB Occasional Paper No. 28. Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1995.

Jones argues that while governing boards typically are extensively involved in institutional planning processes, the role they play in shaping budgets is minimal. He calls on boards to undertake strategic budgeting, which reflects changes in institutional

priorities and behaviors. Strategic budgeting includes several components: strategic initiatives and innovation, contingency, asset maintenance, asset creation/deletion, and the base or continuation budget. The board's role should include: setting expectations, including requiring that the budget encompasses each of the above components; approving the budget, but only after asking comprehensive questions; and advocating for the budget to ensure that there is an environment in which the board can create a strategic budget (i.e., it can keep a contingency fund, maintain assets, etc.). The strategic budgeting process is meant to engage the entire board, not just the budget committee.

Kaze, J. M. "Is this the Future of Lay Governance?" *Trusteeship*, January/February 1996, p. 35.

The author, chair of the board of the Montana University System, questions the value of a proposed change to Montana's higher education governing system. In fall 1996 voters voted on a ballot measure that would eliminate the higher education governing board, replacing it with an education department headed by an executive director. The Governor would appoint the director and an advisory body of citizens that would guide the director. The board duties would be assigned by the Legislature, and the director would be directly responsible to the Governor. In this article written before the vote, Kaze argues that this change would mean more government control over higher education: while the Legislature and Governor now influence all higher education policy decisions, the change would allow them to control those decisions. He argues that this is a dangerous path, and that Montana's higher education system is better served by a lay board of regents.

Kerr, C. *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960–1980*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1991.

In this first of a series of books published by SUNY Press, Kerr draws on his own essays and speeches to discuss what he sees as the third important period of history for American Higher Education, that of 1960 to 1980. He highlights the many changes that occurred during this period of higher education, and the many challenges still to be faced. He notes that there remains a crisis in undergraduate education, and offers several suggestions for addressing this problem. One section of the book is devoted to "governance and leadership under pressure." He discusses higher education as a series of "estates" composed of administrators, faculty, students, and external authorities. No single estate controls or influences everything, Kerr argues. He suggests that the governance of higher education is also in crisis, and suggests that this crisis must be solved by dividing the problem into its various components; he notes that there is no one best solution, and that examination and clarity of functions are essential for finding the proper governance solutions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

———. *Troubled Times for American Higher Education: The 1990s and Beyond.* Albany: SUNY Press, 1994.

This collection of essays discusses the challenges facing higher education in the 1990s and the years beyond and contrasts this with the 1980s, which Kerr calls an "easy decade" for higher education, since enrollment growth was moderate and financing was stable. In various essays, Kerr identifies a series of challenges facing higher education in the 1990s, including concern over the quality of undergraduate education, ethics in higher education, the impending "racial crisis," and increased competition for resources. He concludes that in order to operate effectively in these troubled times, higher education must be dynamic and make changes.

———. *Higher Education Cannot Escape History: Issues for the Twentieth Century.* Albany: SUNY Press, 1994.

In this third publication in the series, Clark Kerr draws upon his numerous essays and speeches to outline the conflicts and contradictions that higher education in this country, as well as abroad, must face as the United States enters the next century. These include: national versus international issues; equality of treatment versus merit in academic pursuits; tradition versus the challenges of the present and future; and differentiation of function versus homogenization of institutions. The essays outline possible solutions to these dilemmas.

Kerr, C. and M. Gade. *The Guardians: Boards of Trustees of American Colleges and Universities, What They Do and How Well They Do It?* Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1989.

Through interviews, questionnaires and observations, the authors examine the role of boards of trustees in higher education. The research addresses three general questions: Are boards of trustees essential to the effective functioning of American higher education? (The authors answer "yes.") Do they work as effectively as they could and should? (The authors answer "no.") Are their roles subject to erosion over time? (The authors suggest "yes.") It is unfortunate, they argue, that boards in the public sector are shifting from a guardian role—which the authors suggest is most important—to a more politicized, representational role. Large systems, they say, can be especially problematic, as trustees have limited knowledge regarding the totality of the system's operations, and therefore tend to concentrate on only a few aspects of the institution. Again, this threatens the boards' role as "guardian." The authors place a great deal of emphasis on the role of the individual trustees, commenting that "a board is only as good as its members." As a result, they suggest, the appointment process needs to be strengthened, allowing for an effective means of nominating, screening and confirming board members. Additional recommendations include the need for a clear division of governance responsibilities: boards must concentrate on overall policy, then delegate other decision making to presidents and faculty members.

———. *The Many Lives of Academic Presidents: Time, Place and Character.* Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1986.

This sequel to the report, *Presidents Make a Difference*, concentrates on an analysis of the academic presidency and how its conduct is affected by changing times and changes in the campus environment. Four different categories of presidential types are identified, based on the strategies used by leaders: (1) path-breaking leaders; (2) managerial leaders; (3) survivors; and (4) scapegoats. The report also identifies four different models of power and presidential influence: hierarchical, collegial consensus, polycentric, and limited.

Kettl, D. *Reinventing Government: Appraising the National Performance Review.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1994.

Kettl examines the progress of the National Performance Review (NPR), Vice President Gore's plan for "reinventing" the federal government. He argues that while NPR made many quick victories (downsizing in certain areas, eliminating bureaucratic procedures in others), these successes came at the expense of building any "sustainable" foundation. He says that the NPR missed the most important lesson—"management, matched to mission, matters most." He argues that to be successful, any reorganization must deal with four critical issues: (1) tensions, (2) capacity—including institutions, processes, resources, and individuals—to do the job, (3) ideas, or a sense of purpose, and (4) the glue that holds it all together. He thinks that NPR and other reorganization proposals make an artificial distinction between *what* should be done and *how* it should be done. The how must shape the what, but it is also driven by it. Successful reinvention must link the big politics of downsizing with the small politics of performance improvement.

Langenberg, D. "Why a System? Understanding the Costs and Benefits of Joining Together." *Change*, March/April 1994, pp. 8–9.

Langenberg, the chancellor of the University of Maryland system, argues that there are many advantages to multicampus systems. First is the "synergy" that comes along with a system. This includes the potential for transforming the performance of individual institutions and the ability to offer more variety to students and to provide more brain power for the states. Secondly, there is a strategic value to systems, since institutions can operate together toward common goals and complementary roles, rather than at cross purposes. Third, systems are more efficient. Fourth, system organization provides for accountability, since the system leadership can make sure the needs of the entire state are met. Finally, systems ensure integrity, since the system can head off inappropriate external intrusion into the affairs of individual institutions. Langenberg argues that through these five areas, the system organization adds value to

the higher education enterprise. He uses examples from his experience at the University of Maryland, a 13-institution multicampus system, to support each of these five points.

Lazerson, M. "Who Owns Higher Education? The Changing Face of Governance." *Change*, March/April 1997, pp. 10–15.

Lazerson notes how governing boards of colleges and universities are becoming increasingly active, often conflicting with academic leaders. He draws parallels with what has happened in corporate sector governance, where "investor activism" represents a break with past practices. He notes three possible scenarios for the future of higher education governance. The most desired option, he argues, is shared governance among trustees, administrators, and faculty. He concludes that trustee activism is not likely to go away, nor is it necessarily a bad thing, and suggests that a higher education system that is more accountable ultimately may be a healthier system.

Lee, E., and F. Bowen. *The Multicampus University*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

This major examination of nine multicampus universities in seven states discusses what was, at the time, a relatively unexamined phenomenon. This study looks at the continuum of the distribution of authority in multicampus systems—specifically, the relationship of the central (system) administration to the campuses within the system, as well as to the state and federal government. Several strengths and shortcomings of multicampus systems are identified. Strengths include: establishment of new campuses; promotion of diversity and specialization, quality control, and efficiencies/economies of scale; and enhanced public and governmental relations. Shortcomings identified include: lack of agreement on various phases of governance; inadequate delegation of fiscal authority; poor indices of budgetary support; insufficient innovation in academic plans and programs; failure of governing boards to consider their role as multicampus rather than single-campus boards; and the inadequacy of the system as a buffer against the state. The authors suggest that the organization or structure must be examined in combination with the political and social context. They argue that the organizational form affects access to power and influences the agenda, goals and values of the system, but that the economy, politics and traditions of the seven states have more to do with the present and future status of the systems than do the particular governance structures.

———. *Managing Multi-Campus Systems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

In this follow-up to their earlier work, Lee and Bowen review and describe the experiences of nine multicampus university systems as they planned for limited growth and fiscal constraints in the early 1970s. The authors argue that academic planning became more of an issue to these systems as higher education began to confront declining enrollments, aging facilities, and increased state involvement. They suggest

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that there must be flexibility within multicampus systems with regard to academic planning and academic budgeting. An "exemplary" system model, they suggest, would include the following: an awareness that most decisions are better made at the campus level; flexibility within the system for resource employment; mechanisms that are able to address issues of personnel retrenchment; systemwide academic programs; and ongoing use of students and faculty to address systemwide issues.

Link, W. *William Friday: Power, Purpose and American Higher Education*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1995.

This biography of William Friday, who was president of the University of North Carolina for 30 years, illustrates the role of one very influential university president and his relationship with his board, the Governor, the Legislature, the faculty, and the individual campus presidents. Friday was president of UNC during the expansion and consolidation of the university system, and presided over the university during many troubling periods. Link focuses heavily on the period when the university was ordered by the U.S. government to develop a plan for desegregation, and Friday fought governmental interference in what he called an attack on academic freedom.

Lorsch, J. W. "Empowering the Board." *Harvard Business Review* 73, no. 1 (January/February 1995), pp. 107–117.

Lorsch discusses the need for outside boards of directors and CEOs of companies to redefine their relationship with one another. In particular, he suggests that outside directors must be empowered to have responsibility for monitoring management, but must respect the boundary between monitoring management and managing the company. What is required, he says, is a new form of teamwork in which directors and managers understand one another's roles and responsibilities and collaborate effectively. Monitoring will not work, he argues, if boards and management have not agreed about their respective roles.

MacTaggart, T., and associates. *Restructuring Higher Education: What Works and What Doesn't in Reorganizing Governing Systems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

This book describes higher education restructuring efforts in five states: North Dakota, Massachusetts, Alaska, Minnesota, and Maryland. Individual chapters address the context and background leading to restructuring, the change process and the outcomes of restructuring in each state. In addition to the individual state cases, the book includes an informative chapter by Richard Novak that analyzes the historical trends in higher education governance, analyzes the advantages and disadvantages of various efforts, and concludes with some options for effective governance restructuring. The book concludes with a set of ideas for policy makers and higher education executives about what works and what doesn't in the restructuring of higher education.

Mahtesian, C. "Higher Ed: The No-Longer-Sacred Cow." *Governing*, July 1995, pp. 20–26

This article looks at the increasing legislative interest and involvement in higher education. Focusing on Ohio, Mahtesian looks at legislative interest in where and how money for higher education is spent. Whether through performance funding or other measures, he argues that legislators will increasingly ask colleges and universities to focus on undergraduate education and to find tangible ways to demonstrate how higher education contributes to the state economy.

Mazzoni, T. "The Changing Politics of State Education Policy Making: A 20-year Minnesota Perspective." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 15, no. 4 (Winter 1993), pp. 357–379.

Mazzoni attempts to describe educational policy making in Minnesota based on 20 case studies conducted over the past two decades. In reviewing the various policy innovations attempted and adopted in the state, he found that most were launched by politicians—educational interest groups launched only a few. Part of Mazzoni's purpose in reviewing the educational policy making in the state for the past 20 years is to test the Iannaccone model of state school politics. This model says that the key to policy-making dynamics lies in the relationship between interest groups themselves and between interest groups and the Legislature. This developmental model assumes states evolve in their approach to policy making. Ultimately, while Mazzoni finds some reformulations of Iannaccone's model to be useful, he argues that there are other perspectives that may be more applicable to research on the policy process in education.

McCarthy, M., C. Langdon, and J. Olson. *State Education Governance Structures*. Denver: ECS, 1993.

In this examination of governance in the K–12 sector, the authors argue that the "optimum" governance structures depend on the political context, educational objectives and educational priorities of each state. Examining the structural changes in K–12 governance during the 1980s, the report finds only one major trend, that of centralizing authority in the Governor's office. The authors cite dramatic changes in the state's role in education over the past decade, including increased involvement of political, civic, and business leaders in the business of education. The primary tensions in K–12 governance include: political versus professional control; centralization versus decentralization; the legislative role versus that of the state education agency; and the use of mandates versus incentives. The report argues that structures should be viewed as vehicles to advance the state's values and goals, but the structure should not drive the system.

McDonald, J. G. *Changing State Policies to Strengthen Public University and College Trustee Selection and Education.* Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1995.

This paper examines the experiences of three states (Kentucky, Massachusetts and Minnesota) that have reformed the selection process for college and university trustees by establishing nominating commissions to bring names to the Governor or Legislature. To determine how well these reforms have worked, interviews were conducted with members of screening committees, legislators, faculty, and administrators in each of these states. Generally, the results have been positive, and most agree that while politics has not been eliminated, the selection process is an improvement over the former system. The report also examines the implementation of trustee orientation and in-service education programs in Arkansas, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kentucky. The author concludes that it is difficult to pass reform legislation regarding trustee selection or education if there is no crisis or scandal in higher education. Once passed, the cost of such activities can be problematic, because the Legislature is often not willing to pay for them.

McDonnell, L. M. "Policy Design as Instrument Design." Paper prepared for the 1988 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., September 1–4, 1988.

McDonnell suggests that there are four categories of policy instruments that capture the range of approaches available to policy makers in implementing policies: mandates, inducements, capacity building and system changing. The determination of the type of instrument depends on the general problem that must be solved. She also argues that there are six types of resources/constraints that should be taken into account in the selection of policy instruments: institutional context, governmental capacity, fiscal resources, political support or opposition, information, and past policy choices.

McGuinness, A. C. "The Changing Structure of State Higher Education Leadership." *Postsecondary Education Structures Handbook.* By A. C. McGuinness, R. M. Epper, and S. Arredondo. Denver: ECS, 1994.

In this introductory essay to the *Postsecondary Education Structures Handbook*, McGuinness summarizes the current status of state higher education structures and documents how those structures have evolved over the past 25 years. He provides an historical review of state structures and how they have changed since the early 1970s. In the 1970s, he argues, there was a move for more efficient use of limited public resources at a time of slower enrollment growth. This, combined with increasing demands placed on the federal government, led to a much greater state role in postsecondary education than had previously been the case. In the 1980s, governors and legislators became increasingly involved in the issue of quality in higher education, particularly through such issues as assessment and performance indicators. The early

1990s, McGuinness argues, are characterized by increasing concern with efficiency, workload, and faculty commitment to teaching. For each decade, he documents some of the key structural changes that have been made in individual states, both in state agencies and in higher education systems. He concludes by providing a series of guidelines for states that are considering reorganizing their higher education structures.

———. *Perspectives on the Current Status of and Emerging Policy Issues for Public Multicampus Higher Education Systems.* AGB Occasional Paper No. 3. Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1991.

McGuinness begins by describing the different types of multicampus systems, and the developments in these systems in the 1970s and 1980s. He then discusses the major trends or issues likely to affect multicampus systems in the 1990s: greater expectations for providing policy leadership and for accountability; renewed concerns about centralization; continuing uncertainties in the political environment, including turnover among governors and legislators; and increasing difficulty in obtaining strong board appointments or in encouraging strong system leadership.

———. *Restructuring State Roles In Higher Education: A Case Study of the 1994 New Jersey Higher Education Restructuring Act.* Denver: ECS, 1995.

The author begins this examination of the New Jersey Higher Education Restructuring Act with background on the context of higher education in New Jersey and the development of state-level coordination prior to 1994. His review of the evolution of the 1994 act includes a series of questions asked by the Governor's Advisory Panel on Restructuring, the group given the task of rethinking the structure of higher education in New Jersey. He concludes with several observations drawn from the New Jersey experience that are relevant to other states as well: states should periodically take a fresh look at their state-level policies and structures to determine whether they are adequate for current challenges; rather than simply considering decentralization, states should consider redefining the center; the public is much more concerned with accessibility, affordability and quality than they are with the governance of higher education; reorganization of the higher education system may be insufficient, as fundamental changes in the relationship between state government and higher education may be necessary; and higher education structures cannot be adopted from one state to another effectively, since each state has its unique context and history.

———. "State Higher Education Policy for the 21st Century." Draft Report prepared for ECS, November 29, 1993.

This paper provides a "framework for evaluating the adequacy of current policies and structures for supporting long-term systemic change" in higher education. McGuinness argues that the key is to make expectations explicit and then create a policy environment

that stimulates and supports creative, cost-effective responses. He calls for a substantive review or evaluation of state higher education policies and structures every 8 to 12 years. These reviews should be long-term, focused, qualitative, and quantitative evaluations that consider all of higher education and the relationships with state government and other entities such as K–12. Necessary information includes environmental scans, informal and formal policy reviews, focus groups and public opinion polling.

McGuinness, A. C., R. M. Epper, and S. Arredondo. *State Postsecondary Education Structures Handbook*. Denver: ECS, 1994.

This handbook, revised every few years, provides general information on postsecondary education structures in the 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. Information includes the type of statewide agency (governing board, coordinating board, etc.), its responsibilities (including type and scope of institutions as well as their role in budget and program review), the responsibilities of institutional governing boards, information on staffing of state and system agencies, and membership of state and institutional boards. Data are presented in comparative national tables and in individual state profiles.

McMahon, E. M. "Institutional Autonomy and Public Accountability: A Delicate Balance." *Connections*, Spring 1995, pp. 45–46. Boston, MA: New England Board of Higher Education.

In this brief article, the author suggests that the recent restructuring of the state higher education system in New Jersey—which reduced the size, scope and regulatory authority of the state agency—may provide many lessons for the future of higher education governance, at least in New England. McMahon suggests that the restructured system in New Jersey could serve as a national model of accountability, decentralization and expanded site-based management in higher education.

———. "Lessons from the East: The Reinvention of Public Higher Education in New Jersey." Remarks prepared for the meeting of the National Advisory Committee to the State Structures for the Governance of Higher Education Project of The California Higher Education Policy Center, San Jose, January 10, 1996.

The author provides background information on the changes in the governance of higher education in New Jersey—changes that have resulted in a new, less powerful commission on higher education, with increased responsibility given to individual presidents and trustees at the campus level. McMahon suggests that the underlying lessons of the New Jersey experience derive from the importance of the questions that the state was willing to address, namely: Are there functions that could more effectively and efficiently be carried out at the institutional level? If so, what, if any, new

organizational structures or mechanisms of accountability are needed? She argues that while every state's structure must be tailored to its own context and needs, every state would also benefit from asking these questions.

Millett, J. D. *Conflict in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Millett examines the relationship between state government and public higher education. He reviews several earlier studies that deal with this issue, including works by Glenny and Berdahl, and reports by the Carnegie Commission and ECS. He argues that state involvement in higher education derives from two interests: (1) administration and management, which lead to concerns about economies and efficiencies, and (2) coordination, which leads to concerns with controlling growth. Based on data collected in 25 states, he focuses on three types of statewide boards—governing, coordinating and advisory boards—and he reviews the advantages and disadvantages of each. In general, Millett argues that governing boards become too closely tied to the campuses and are therefore unable to address the concerns of the state. Coordinating boards, he argues, are better able to identify with state interests, but often lack the authority or the political constituency to make a difference.

———. *Management, Governance and Leadership*. New York: AMACOM, 1980.

In a chapter devoted to university governance, Millett defines governance as "the act of deciding what to do and how to do it within an organization." He says that in a university, this involves decisions about mission, values, programs, resources, enrollments, organizational arrangements, personnel standards, facilities, and budget and evaluation processes. Governing boards, he argues, are the agencies that must remind faculty and students of the institution's public support. He sees the fact that these boards are separated from the learning processes of individual campuses as the primary disadvantage of multicampus governing boards. Another disadvantage, he thinks, is that systems often seek common solutions rather than unique responses based on the individual needs of campuses within the system. At the same time, systems can promote diversity, broaden political (and geographical) support in the state Legislature, and facilitate communication with state officials.

Mingle, J. R. *The Case for Coordinated Systems of Higher Education*. Denver: SHEEO, 1995.

Mingle argues for the value of coordinated systems, both at the state and multicampus levels. He suggests that: size is an asset, because systems can serve a mass market and bring together significant financial and intellectual resources; systems make it easier for institutions to partner with one another; systems can serve as utility companies in such areas as the use of technology; and systems build trust among institutions. He acknowledges that there are some weaknesses to systems and that several reforms are

needed: state government should allow certain administrative mechanisms (e.g., personnel, contracting) to be done at the system level; accountability mechanisms should be established that are responsive to customers, not just legislators. Mingle argues that system boards are the mediators between the supplier and the consumer, and the only mechanism for creating a common agenda between the two.

Mitroff, I., R. Mason, and C. Pearson. *FrameBreak: The Radical Redesign of American Business*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.

This management text, which offers interesting insights into why corporations can no longer rely on the structures that worked for them in the past, identifies some of the critical dimensions—e.g., issues management, crisis management, environmentalism, globalism—that organizations must address in order to survive in the rapidly changing economy. The authors suggest four key organizational components that are necessary for organizations to "break the frame" of the old structure: (1) knowledge and learning; (2) recovery and development; (3) world service and spirituality; and (4) world-class operations. The authors argue that organizations must address the broader interests and concerns of their employees—and they describe ways to do so. The authors also stress that businesses need to understand how their operations affect the larger environment. There are useful connections here to systems of higher education; institutions must address the needs of their own faculty and staff, while also asking how institutional activities meet the needs of the community or state.

Novak, R. "Statewide Governance: Autonomy or Accountability Revisited." *Trusteeship*, March/April 1993, pp. 10–14.

Novak reviews two types of legislative proposals under consideration in state legislatures at the time of this writing (1993): those that affect governance structures, and those that affect budget controls and state oversight. Novak identifies a trend in the 1980s and 1990s toward decentralizing statewide structures, in the spirit of "reinventing government." While as many as 10 states were reconsidering their governance structures during this legislative term, Novak reports that 16 states were considering changes in their budget control and state oversight mechanisms. In 8 states, institutions sought a relaxation of state reporting requirements in the hope of increasing institutional autonomy in administration and fiscal affairs. In another 8 states, Novak says, legislators sought greater accountability from institutions, thus calling for a reduction of institutional autonomy. He suggests that this insistence on greater accountability is growing as legislators become more and more concerned with the perceived lack of fiscal accountability enjoyed by higher education, particularly given the scarcity of state dollars and a growing distrust of higher education. He predicts that the results of the 1993 session may be precursors of things to come in the autonomy/accountability debates.

———. *Statewide Governance, Coordination, and Trusteeship in Public Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography*. Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1995.

This extensive bibliography provides a current and historical list of publications on governance of public higher education over the last 70 years. Sources are categorized in four broad areas: studies of state governance and coordination, public sector trusteeship and board/president relations, community colleges, and individual state reports.

Osborne, D., and T. Gaebler. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1992.

This book illustrates, through numerous examples, ways in which government can be "reinvented" to become more effective in today's society. The authors focus on ten principles around which "entrepreneurial public organizations" are built. These kinds of organizations, according to the authors: (1) steer more than they row; (2) empower communities, not just deliver services; (3) encourage competition, not monopoly; (4) are driven by missions rather than rules; (5) fund outcomes, not inputs; (6) meet the needs of the customer; (7) concentrate on earning, not just spending money; (8) invest in prevention of problems, not just cure; (9) decentralize authority; and (10) use market mechanisms to solve problems, rather than creating new public programs. Ideas from many of these principles can be applied to governance of higher education at state and system levels.

Osborne, D., and P. Plastrik. *Banishing Bureaucracy: The Five Strategies for Reinventing Government*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1996.

The authors take the concepts from *Reinventing Government* and lay out the strategies that they say will transform bureaucratic systems or organizations into entrepreneurial ones. They define reinvention as the fundamental transformation of public systems and organizations to create dramatic increases in their effectiveness, efficiency, adaptability, and capacity to innovate. The strategies identified as necessary to make fundamental changes include: (1) the core strategy, which deals with purpose, or improving the steering of the organization; (2) the consequences strategy, which uses incentives as a leverage point; (3) the customer strategy, which uses accountability as its lever; (4) the control strategy, which pushes decision-making power throughout the hierarchy; and (5) the culture strategy, which deals with the values, norms and behavior of the organization. The authors argue that the strategies must be applied at all levels of the organization (including the governing systems, administrative systems, organization, work processes, and employee relations). The majority of the book is dedicated to examples of how different organizations and governments have used each of the strategies. It concludes with tips on how to align strategies with one another, and a discussion of the "rules for reinvention."

O'Toole, J., and W. Bennis. "Our Federalist Future: The Leadership Imperative." *An Invented Life: Reflections on Leadership and Change*. By W. Bennis. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1993.

This essay examines the role of federalism in today's society and argues that federations hold the most promise for organizing governmental or corporate organizations today. The authors describe the primary characteristics of federalism, which have remained constant since the days of Madison: *noncentralization*, where power resides in many semi-autonomous constituent centers; *negotiationalism*, where decisions are made through an ongoing process of bargaining between units and the central authority, or among units themselves; *constitutionalism*, where there is a written covenant that outlines the basic purpose and mission of the overarching institution; *territoriality*, which defines distinct boundaries between the constituent units; *balance of power* between the central authority and the units, as well as between the units themselves; and *autonomy*, where individual units are free to be self-governing to the extent that they do not violate the fundamental mission of the overarching institution. The authors argue that federalism is a necessity in today's complex world, but that it is also very fragile and requires strong leadership to preserve balances of power. Generally, they argue, the basic rule of federalism is that the central authority is responsible for the why and the what, while individual units are responsible for the how.

Peterson, P. *The Price of Federalism*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1995.

Peterson discusses two kinds of theories of federalism: functional and legislative. Functional theories identify distinct areas of competence (i.e., developmental or redistributive) for each level of government. According to these theories, the national government should assume responsibility for policies that redistribute wealth or services (such as medicare, welfare and pensions), while state or local governments should be responsible for policies that assist in the creation of the infrastructure necessary for economic development. The division of responsibilities among levels of government must respect the comparative advantage of each, he argues. Legislative theories of federalism are less optimistic. These theories assume the greater importance of policy roles of state legislatures or local governing bodies, and argue that the perverse incentives of federal models lead to disequilibrium. Peterson advocates the functional theory, suggesting that there are appropriate and distinct responsibilities that should be carried out at the federal (or central) level and others that should be the responsibility of the state (or local) level. If functional theory is correct, he argues, the national government will continue to assume responsibility for redistributive efforts while the state and local governments will take responsibility for facilitating economic development.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pickens, W. "California Perspectives: Three Viewpoints. Higher Education and Society's Needs." *Change* 21, no. 5 (September/October 1989), pp. 43–51.

Pickens reviews three separate studies of California Higher Education conducted in the 1980s. He argues that these studies, taken together, represent the most extensive review of how colleges and universities function in a single state. The groups that produced these studies are: the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (comprised of business and community leaders as well as higher education governing board members); the Joint Committee for the Review of the Master Plan (which included legislators from both parties); and a study group from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris. The article briefly describes each study and its perspective on the contributions of higher education to a diverse society. Pickens notes that whereas the original Master Plan was concerned primarily with defining opportunities for ambitious and mostly middle-class individuals, these reports are concerned with demographic realities and how demographic changes now dominate planning for higher education.

Posner, B., and L. Rothstein. "Reinventing the Business of Government: An Interview with Change Catalyst David Osborne." *Harvard Business Review* 72, no. 3 (May/June 1994), pp. 133–143.

In this interview with two editors of the *Harvard Business Review*, Osborne (co-author of *Reinventing Government*) suggests that the first questions to be asked in restructuring efforts are: "What business are we in?" and "What is our mission?" Next, organizations must ask who their customers are. Osborne argues that it is important to establish consequences for the actions of people and organizations, and that organizations must find ways to measure performance. In addition, he thinks that in relation to restructuring, it important to look at the issue of control; people on the front lines need more control if the organization is to respond to the needs of its customers. He stresses that change will not happen overnight, but that incremental changes are critical—and that those changes must be acknowledged and rewarded when they are successful.

Ruppert, S. A. *The Politics of Remedy: State Legislative Views on Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: NEA National Center for Innovation and Office of Higher Education, 1996.

This report presents the results of a survey conducted with chairs of higher education committees in state legislatures across the country. Legislators were asked to comment on questions in four broad categories: What are the expectations and roles of higher education? How should higher education be organized and governed? How can access to higher education be accommodated with limited state resources? And how should higher education be funded and held accountable for the results? Responses are

analyzed nationally, as well as by the following subgroups: by region, by type of governing arrangement, by level of tuition and fees, by size of state appropriation to higher education, and by expectations for growth in the student population. The author argues that the findings reveal a significant amount of legislative concern and debate in search of remedies to the challenges facing higher education.

Schick, E. *The "Local Board" in Multicampus University Systems*. AGB Occasional Paper No. 25. Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1995.

This report examines the roles and functions of local boards of multicampus systems. Findings are based on questionnaires, interviews and examinations of state statutes and policies. Schick cites the growth in the number of local boards in recent years, and provides observations and recommendations on management, leadership, activities, and the organization and structure of these boards. He concludes that effective local boards are crucial to maintaining public confidence in colleges and universities, and are important for advocacy.

Schick, E., R. Novak, J. Norton, and H. Elam. *Shared Visions of Public Higher Education Governance: Structures and Leadership Styles that Work*. Washington, D.C.: AASCU, 1993.

This book examines what the authors identify as "effective" governance structures in four states: Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Maine. The authors aim to identify factors, structures and procedures that contribute to effective statewide coordination and governance. They stress several key criteria for effective structures, including: strong presidential leadership; ongoing communication; accountability measures which provide educational leaders with the authority to manage resources; and institutional vision and an awareness of the broader social and educational environment. The authors suggest that in effective structures all leaders, after extensive internal debate, speak externally with one voice. The authors argue that structures must be customized for each state—there is no one best model. However, they also claim that structures should generally decentralize day-to-day operations and include institutional and system representatives in long-range planning.

Scott, R. M. "The Future of State-Level Coordination." Speech presented at the SHEEO Academic and Governmental Relations Annual Meeting, St. Louis, August 27, 1995.

Scott begins by discussing the forces for change in higher education that derive from state, federal and institutional levels. The state board is the focal point for these changes, he argues, because it is the only entity responsible for examining the entire "system" of higher education. He notes several points of tension for state coordination at present, including the tensions between state needs and campus missions. The top priority for coordinating boards should be planning, he argues, and boards should coordinate the

matching of public and employer needs with institutional capacities. Scott calls for a reexamination of the fundamental principles of higher education (i.e., access, affordability, quality).

Searle, C. F. *Balancing State and Local Control.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

This book presents a series of analyses of the struggle between state and local control over community colleges in several states. It describes the situation of governance of community colleges in Connecticut, California, Florida, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Mississippi, and Illinois. At the time of its writing, the trend in most of these states was toward a highly centralized governance system, which many local community college districts opposed. The book also includes a resource guide for information on the governance of community colleges.

Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education. *A Program for Renewed Partnership.* Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing, 1980.

Written when higher education was expecting "retrenchments" in enrollments, this report presents a series of recommendations for state and federal policy aimed at improving the relationship between government and higher education. Recommendations for federal policy include: creation of a single, consolidated agency at the federal level for enforcement of equal opportunity laws; and greater coherence in federal financial aid programs, with the central purpose aimed at lowering financial barriers to postsecondary education. At the state level, the commission calls for states to revise their basic appropriation formulas to prepare for retrenchments, and for institutions to make the necessary adjustments for declining enrollments. In addition, the report argues that the composition of governing boards should be strengthened—with lay members providing a majority—and that each state should arrange for periodic review of the quality of its institutions (to be conducted by academic peers, not state officials).

State Policy Reports 13, no. 15 (1994). Special issue on "Reorganizing State Government." Columbus, OH: State Policy Research.

This issue of *State Policy Reports* briefly outlines the efforts of state governments from the 1960s through the early 1980s to reorganize higher education. It notes that the major cost savings and program improvements promised by such efforts did not occur. As a result, subsequent reorganization efforts have been more incremental. Some changes that have been consistently popular in recent efforts at state reorganization include: increasing the independence of public hospitals; providing universities with more flexibility from state regulations; and making economic development efforts more like private sector efforts. Several examples of state deregulation efforts are included. In addition, this issue includes information on

changes in gubernatorial powers since 1955 and provides rankings of current governors in terms of their effectiveness (according to public opinion polls and experts).

Task Force on State Policy and Independent Higher Education. *The Preservation of Excellence in American Higher Education: The Essential Role of Private Colleges and Universities.* Denver: ECS, 1990.

This report examines the role of private colleges and universities in meeting public purposes for higher education in a given state, and considers the impact of state policy on that role. The report includes information on the percentage of students enrolled in private institutions, and on the components of current state policies toward private higher education. The task force, chaired by Clark Kerr and John Ashcroft, raises concerns about the continued role of private institutions because of such issues as declining enrollment shares, problems of affordability, etc. The task force makes several recommendations for state policy makers, including: making private higher education integral to meeting state objectives for higher education; incorporating private institutions into policy-making and policy-review mechanisms; maintaining and/or enhancing the portability of student aid; and creating incentives to enhance the capacity of private colleges and universities.

Taylor, B., R. Chait, and T. Holland. "The New Work of the Nonprofit Board." *Harvard Business Review* 74, no. 5 (September/October 1996), pp. 36–46.

This article discusses the need for "new work" in nonprofit boards. New work includes enhancing board involvement in key issues rather than having the board simply listen to and approve management decisions. It involves having the board interact with management in establishing and implementing policies, rather than having restrictive lines where the board sets policy and management implements it. The new board should reflect the strategic priorities of the institution, and board meetings should be goal-driven rather than process-driven. Finally, the board should act as a team for the collective good of the organization, rather than serve only as a collection of high-powered people who do not work together. The authors argue that institutional reform should not be expected in the absence of reform of the work of the boards.

Trow, M. "Federalism in American Higher Education." *Higher Learning in America 1980–2000.* Edited by A. Levine. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Trow traces the development of federalism in—and a national policy for—American higher education. He places in perspective the role of the federal government, which he describes as substantial but significantly smaller in power and direct influence than the role of the states. He traces this development from the colonial period, through the revolution, and in post-revolutionary times. He notes that the broad purpose of national

policy, though not articulated specifically, is to encourage states and local entities to provide education, to broaden access, and to contribute both to the work of society and to learning and scholarship—all without directly impinging on institutional autonomy or state responsibility. Several events, including the GI Bill, the Land Grant Act, and the Higher Education Amendments of 1972, helped to define this policy, he argues. Trow ends with a discussion of the declining public trust in higher education, and he questions whether this, combined with government interest in equal rights for all citizens, will lead to changes in the "unique and fruitful" three-cornered relationships between institutions, the states, and the federal government.

———. Presentation to the Board of Regents of the University of California, January 18, 1996.

In this presentation to the University of California Board of Regents, Trow discusses the recent decision to end affirmative action programs in admissions and hiring at the university, with particular emphasis on the relationship between the Academic Senate, the faculty at large, the administration, and the Regents. He argues that in the case of the affirmative action decision, one cost of the public split between the university president and the Regents was that it blocked the chief channel of communications between faculty and the Regents (the president's office). The welfare of the university depends on the relationship between the Regents and the president, he argues; they must be on the same page, at least publicly.

Welburn, B. L. "Playing Politics With State Boards: Questions to Ask About Change." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 15, 1995, pp. 29–30.

Welburn, the executive director of the National Association of State Boards of Education, argues that the governance of K–12 education has come to the forefront of legislative agendas since the last elections. There is, however, no clear trend as to the model of governance that is preferred: some states are trying to eliminate their state boards while others are creating them; some states are moving from elected to appointed boards while others are doing just the opposite. The author argues that lay boards of education, while not perfect, are critical in providing checks and balances on legislative and executive bodies. Lay boards, she suggests, must be advocates for public education, must communicate a vision for improving education, and must be accountable for the results of these efforts.

Wheatley, M. J. *Leadership and the New Science*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 1992.

Wheatley argues that we have become fixated on structures, believing that they have to be strong and complex. She notes that most organizations are very Newtonian, with responsibilities that are organized into functions, people that are organized into roles and organizational charts that depict the workings of a machine. This is a world filled

with boundaries, she argues, and we need to think about structures as more temporary or flexible. We need to see fluctuations, disturbances, and imbalances as sources of creativity, not destruction. The critical piece, she argues, is the relationship between the person and the setting. Patterns of relationships and the capacities to form them are most important. Changes in small places create large system change because they are "part of an unbroken wholeness." Open systems maintain non-equilibrium, keeping off-balance so that they can change and grow.

Wheatley, M. J., and M. Kellner-Rogers. "Self Organization: The Irresistible Future of Organizing." *Strategy & Leadership*, July/August 1996, pp.18–24.

The authors argue that if we want organizations to be adaptive, flexible and intelligent, we must shift from thinking of them as machines and begin treating them as living organisms. The authors identify three fundamental dimensions of the living organization: identity, information and relationships. Identity includes vision, mission and values, as well as the organization's interpretation of what it has been in the past and will be in the future. Information, which keeps organizations dynamic, is created and transformed through relationships, which demonstrate the intelligence of the system. Organizations must "self organize," the authors argue, to sustain themselves and respond intelligently to needs for change.

Zumeta, W. "State Policies and Private Higher Education." *Journal of Higher Education* 63, no. 4 (July/August 1992), pp. 363–417.

In this article, Zumeta argues that the health and capacity of the independent sector of higher education is an important state policy concern. He reviews some of the major state policies that affect independent higher education, including: undergraduate state student aid, public sector tuition, state programmatic funding for private institutions, and involvement of the independent sector in state planning activities. The article summarizes the results from national surveys that examine the key state policies affecting independent higher education and the connections, if any, between these policies. Zumeta finds that the nature and extent of state involvement in these areas is quite varied. Most states do less to "recognize and take full advantage" of the private sector than their own "best interest" suggests they should. Wealthier states—and those where private institutions have had a larger share of the postsecondary education market—typically have more favorable policies towards the independent sector. In addition, Zumeta found that states with regulatory coordinating boards (as opposed to consolidated governing boards) have more favorable policies toward the independents. Zumeta cites the increasing demands for higher education, in combination with increased economic stringency, as reasons that state policy makers should insure the health of the private sector.

Appendix

National Advisory Committee Members

Chair

Robert Atwell, President, American Council on Education

Vice Chair

Virginia Smith, Director, Futures Project, A Consortium of California Independent Colleges

Members

Julie Davis Bell, Education Program Director, National Conference of State Legislatures

Carol A. Cartwright, President, Kent State University

Richard Chait, Director, Center for Higher Education Governance and Leadership, University of Maryland, College Park

Lyman Glenny, Professor Emeritus, University of California, Berkeley

Paul Goren, Executive Director, Policy and Strategic Services, Minneapolis Public Schools

Alan Guskin, Chancellor, Antioch University

D. Bruce Johnstone, University Professor and Former Chancellor, State University of New York

Richard W. Jonson, Executive Director, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

Richard Licht, State of Rhode Island Board of Governors

Anne-Marie McCartan, Vice Chancellor, Virginia Community College System

Eleanor McMahon, Distinguished Visiting Professor, A. Alfred Taubman Public Policy Center, Brown University

Kenneth P. Mortimer, President, University of Hawaii

Barry Munitz, Chancellor, California State University

Donald Phelps, W. K. Kellogg Regents Professor, Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas, Austin

Piedad Robertson, Superintendent and President, Santa Monica Community College

Guillermo Rodriguez, Executive Director, Latino Issues Forum

The California Higher Education Policy Center

The California Higher Education Policy Center is a nonprofit, independent, nonpartisan organization created to stimulate public discussion and debate concerning the purposes, goals and organization of higher education in California.

Single copies of this publication are available until June 30, 1997, from The California Higher Education Policy Center, 160 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 704, San Jose, California 95113. For an immediate response, please FAX requests to (408) 287-6709. Ask for Report No. 97-12. This document will soon be available on the world wide web at http://www.policycenter.org. It will also soon be available through the Educational Research Information Clearinghouse (ERIC) microfiche system. To locate the ERIC microfiche collection nearest you, call 800-LET-ERIC.

Copyright, 1997, by The California Higher Education Policy Center. Copies may not be sold. The Center grants permission to copy and distribute this publication, with acknowledgment of The California Higher Education Policy Center.

Published by The California Higher Education Policy Center

CENTER REPORTS

93-1 PUBLIC POLICY BY ANECDOTE: The Case of Community College Fees. By William H. Trombley. April 1993.

93-2 THE CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY VACUUM: The Example of Student Fees. By Patrick M. Callan. April 1993.

93-3 THE PRESS AND CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION. By William Chance. May 1993.

93-4 BY DESIGN OR DEFAULT? By Patrick M. Callan and Joni E. Finney. June 1993.

93-5 ON THE BRINK: The Impact of Budget Cuts on California's Public Universities. By Jack McCurdy and William Trombley. August 1993.

93-6 THE CLOSING GATEWAY: Californians Consider Their Higher Education System. By John Immerwahr and Steve Farkas. September 1993.

94-1 TIME FOR DECISION: California's Legacy and the Future of Higher Education. March 1994.

94-4 BROKEN PROMISES: The Impact of Budget Cuts and Fee Increases on the California Community Colleges. By Jack McCurdy. November 1994.

95-1 FINANCING THE PLAN: California's Master Plan for Higher Education, 1960 to 1994. By William Pickens. May 1995.

95-2 A STATE OF EMERGENCY? California's Crisis in Higher Education. By David W. Breneman. February 1995.

95-3 PRESERVING THE HIGHER EDUCATION LEGACY: A Conversation with California Leaders. By John Immerwahr with Jill Boese. March 1995.

95-4 TRENDS IN STUDENT AID: California. By Lawrence E. Gladieux and Jacqueline E. King. April 1995.

96-3 SHARED RESPONSIBILITY: Strategies for Quality and Opportunity in California Higher Education. May 1996.

96-4 SUPPLEMENT TO SHARED RESPONSIBILITY: A Resource Guide. June 1996.

97-1 ENDURING VALUES, CHANGING CONCERNS: What Californians Expect from Their Higher Education System. By John Immerwahr. March 1997.

97-2 SHAPING THE FUTURE: Higher Education Finance in the 1990s, National Trends. Includes "The Price of Passive Resistance in Financing Higher Education," by Brian M. Roherty, and "The Changing Landscape: Higher Education Finance in the 1990s," by David W. Breneman and Joni E. Finney. April 1997. (Also see case studies of California, Florida, Michigan, Minnesota, and New York, published separately as Technical Reports.)

97-8 CALIFORNIA TRENDS IN STUDENT AID: 1990 to 1996. By Lawrence E. Gladieux, Tracy Hartzler Toon and Watson Scott Swail. June 1997.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

94-2 A MODEST PROPOSAL . . . for Saving University Research from the Budget Butcher. By Jack Miles. September 1994.

94-3 PRESERVING THE MASTER PLAN: What is to be Done in a New Epoch of More Limited Growth of Resources? By Clark Kerr. October 1994.

96-5 STATE STUDENT AID POLICIES AND INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION: Implications for California. By William Zumeta with John Fawcett-Long. August 1996.

97-9 A VISION IN PROGRESS: The Decision to Establish a Public University at Monterey Bay. By William Chance. June 1997.

TECHNICAL REPORTS

93-1 THE PAST AS PROLOGUE: Examining the Consequences of Business as Usual. By Dennis P. Jones, Ronald G. Parker and Peter T. Ewell. July 1993.

95-5 FINANCING THE CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN: A Data Base of Public Finance for Higher Education in California, 1958–59 to 1994–95. By William Pickens. April 1995. (See updated version, Technical Report #97-10)

95-6 TIDAL WAVE II: An Evaluation of Enrollment Projections for California Higher Education. By David W. Breneman, Leobardo F. Estrada and Gerald C. Hayward. September 1995.

96-1 FOCUS ON STUDENTS: The Student Composition of California Higher Education. By William Doyle. January 1996.

96-2 HIGHER EDUCATION FINANCE: An Annotated Bibliography. By William Doyle. February 1996.

97-3 CALIFORNIA: Financing Higher Education Amid Policy Drift, 1990 to 1995. (Part of the national finance project, Higher Education Finance in the 1990s.) By Mario C. Martinez and Thad Nodine. April 1997.

97-4 FLORIDA: Protecting Access and Anticipating Growth, 1990 to 1995. (Part of the national finance project, Higher Education Finance in the 1990s.) By Yolanda Sanchez-Penley, Mario C. Martinez and Thad Nodine. April 1997.

97-5 MICHIGAN: Fiscal Stability and Constitutional Autonomy, 1990 to 1995. (Part of the national finance project, Higher Education Finance in the 1990s.) By Mario C. Martinez and Thad Nodine. April 1997.

97-6 MINNESOTA: Uncertainty in a Time of Constrained Resources, 1990 to 1995. (Part of the national finance project, Higher Education Finance in the 1990s.) By Joan E. Sundquist. April 1997.

97-7 NEW YORK: Politics and the Funding of Higher Education, 1990 to 1995. (Part of the national finance project, Higher Education Finance in the 1990s.) By Kathy Reeves Bracco and Yolanda Sanchez-Penley. April 1997.

97-10 FINANCING THE CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN: A Data Base of Public Finance for Higher Education in California, 1958–59 to 1996–97. By William Pickens. June 1997. (Updated version of Technical Paper #95-5.)

97-11 STATE STRUCTURES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: A Comparative Study. By Frank M. Bowen, Kathy Reeves Bracco, Patrick M. Callan, Joni E. Finney, Richard C. Richardson, Jr., and William Trombley. Spring 1997.

97-12 STATE STRUCTURES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: An Annotated Bibliography. By Kathy Reeves Bracco. Spring 1997.

97-13 STATE STRUCTURES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: California Case Study Summary. By Richard C. Richardson. Spring 1997.

97-14 STATE STRUCTURES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: Florida Case Study Summary. By Joni E. Finney. Spring 1997.

97-15 STATE STRUCTURES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: Georgia Case Study Summary. By Kathy Reeves Bracco. Spring 1997.

97-16 STATE STRUCTURES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: Illinois Case Study Summary. By Richard C. Richardson. Spring 1997.

97-17 STATE STRUCTURES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: Michigan Case Study Summary. By Kathy Reeves Bracco. Spring 1997.

97-18 STATE STRUCTURES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: New York Case Study Summary. By Patrick M. Callan and Frank M. Bowen. Spring 1997.

97-19 STATE STRUCTURES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: Texas Case Study Summary. By Kathy Reeves Bracco. Spring 1997.